

The Sun.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1900.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

DAILY, per Month	\$5.00
DAILY, per Year	50.00
SUNDAY, per Year	2.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, per Year	52.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, per Month	4.50

Postage to foreign countries added.

THE SUN, New York City.

PARIS: Rue de la Paix, 12, near Grand Hotel, and Kiosque No. 10, Boulevard des Capucines.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication will be so kind as to send them to the publishers in care of the publishers for that purpose.

Registration To-day.

To-day is the first day of registration. The places of registry will be open from 7 in the morning until 10 in the evening.

Citizens, therefore, will have ample time in which to perform the duty. Moreover, the registering places are close at hand and the process by which alone they can qualify for voting at the election is completed in a few minutes.

In Chicago, on the first day of registration, the total registered fell only a little behind the unprecedented number brought out in the exciting campaign of 1896; and it was so great that Illinois is now assured to McKinley. In the judgment of experienced political observers of both parties.

A similar result will be indicated by a great registration in New York to-day, and not merely for the State, but possibly for the city also. Tammany's boasts of a big majority for Bryan in the city could have no other justification than that which would be afforded by a small registration, in which would be included, as always happens, every Tammany voter.

With such a registration as that of 1896, Bryan cannot hope for more than a trifling minority in the city of New York, if he gets any at all. He ought to be beaten in this commercial and financial capital and he will be beaten if every vote naturally against him is polled.

This being the fact, it is enough for us to repeat that from 7 in the morning until 10 in the evening the places of registration will be open to-day. To-morrow, Saturday, will be the second day of registration, but, of course, no prudent man, able to discharge the duty at once will put it off even a single day.

Results of the British Elections.

According to the returns received up to midnight on Wednesday, Oct. 10, the Unionists had carried 356 seats, the Opposition, 205; thus, far, then, the Ministerial majority is 151. As in the 100 seats remaining the Unionists are more likely to encounter a net loss than a net gain, they can no longer expect to increase the majority of 152 which they secured in July, 1895.

It follows that Lord Salisbury has failed to obtain what, in his manifesto, he asked the people to give him, namely, a vote of confidence and merely unqualified approval from the conduct of the war, or to give the present Government carte blanche in the matter of a South African programme.

The construction of that programme will tax all the statesmanship that the Unionist leaders have at their command. The problem now presented for solution is threefold, dealing, as it does, with three elements of the South African population, to wit: the Afrikaners of the Cape Colony, the Boers of the Orange Free State and the Boers of the Transvaal. It is already settled that the Afrikaners are not to be exasperated by vindictive measures, but conciliated by lenient treatment; merely the penalty of disfranchisement for a term of years is to be imposed upon those who can be proved to have rebelled against British authority, and to have given aid and comfort to the Boer republics. There are those who think that, if England's purpose be to reconcile as quickly as possible the Afrikaners of the Cape Colony to her supremacy, she might have done wisely to show herself more lenient still, and treat the rebels with as much generosity as she exhibited toward French-Canadians some sixty years ago. We presume, however, that no deep wounds will be inflicted by temporary disfranchisement, and that the Cape Colonists of Hollandian descent will gradually recognize that the new order of things is a finality, and that the dream of an Afrikaner Confederacy in South Africa is over.

The transformation of the former Orange Free State into a British Colony might not to encounter any insuperable difficulties, provided the burghers of that Commonwealth are treated with liberality. They had no quarrel of their own with England, neither had their attitude toward outlanders been hostile or oppressive. It was a feeling of race sympathy, and a chivalrous resolve not to leave their kinsmen unsupported that caused the Orange burghers to risk their national existence by taking the field against the British forces. Such conduct deserves respect and forbearance, and we may probably take for granted that the concession of a large measure of autonomy will be made much more speedily to the Orange River Colony than to the Transvaal. It is the burghers out of the last-named Commonwealth who will give most trouble, not only because they have forfeited the independence which

they held dear, and suffered a grievous waste of blood and property, but because the national question, which for them is one of exceptional gravity, is certain to receive at British hands a treatment which the Boers have deemed incompatible with the interests of white agriculturists. It must be remembered that in the Transvaal the white farmers are vastly outnumbered by the Kaffirs, and the former allege that, in order to assure the safety of their wives and children, they have been forced to adopt a policy of repression toward the native children among white employers under the name of apprentices. We should not be surprised if a considerable section of the Transvaal Boers, when they find that the Kaffirs are to be treated as their equals before the law, should determine to seek a new home, either in German territory or in the region which lies on the northwest of the Zambesi.

Now that the British elections are practically over, we may assume that the South African problem, in its threefold aspect, will receive prompt attention.

A Recantation.

The Philadelphia Times, the first Democratic newspaper in 1896 to declare for McKinley, hoisted the Jolly Roger of Bryanism two weeks ago. By its edition of Wednesday it has evidently returned to the support of the Republican policy on what the Kansas City platform calls the "paramount issue."

But for Mr. Bryan the treaty would have failed in the Senate. But while he favored the treaty of peace with Spain, which gave us the absolute sovereignty of the Philippines, he was then, as he is now, the strenuous opponent of the imperialistic colonial policy that has been violently opposed by the Administration. He knew the value of the sovereignty of those possessions, but he demanded for them what he demands for his own people: the right to govern themselves, and the right to the territory of expansion of the sovereignty of our Government and at the same time earnestly opposed to all efforts of peace or war to govern people against their will.

Where the American flag has been planted by the sword of our arms and navy and by the treaty of peace with Spain, it must ever remain, but it should not float as a symbol of oppression. Where the flag goes the Constitution and laws of the Union go with it.

When the Bryanistic froth has been blown away from this McKinley policy is left clear and solid excepting as to the idea that the Constitution follows the flag. That question, as the Hon. BENJAMIN HARRISON said but yesterday in urging McKinley's election, "is with the Supreme Court of the United States."

The decisions of the Supreme Court heretofore indicate overwhelmingly that the Republican view will be conclusively adopted; and that the contention of the contemporary writers in Philadelphia with the Republican programme of expansion will necessarily be completely.

Mr. McKeljohn, Mr. Bryan and the Sultan of Jolo.

The correspondence between Mr. McKELJOHN, the Assistant Secretary of War, and Mr. BRYAN regarding slavery in the Sulu Islands touches one of the most interesting and at the same time what is apparently one of the most difficult questions attending the process of national expansion. That it is to say, Mr. BRYAN has done his best to make it seem a difficult question.

At Tipton in Indiana last week Mr. BRYAN was reported as saying:

"We fought then [in the Civil War] for the adoption of a Constitutional amendment that provided that no man could own a slave, and yet before the Philippine war is ended we have the Sulu treaty, which recognizes slavery."

Thereupon Assistant Secretary McKELJOHN wrote to Mr. BRYAN calling his attention to the fact that no "Sulu treaty" recognizing slavery in those islands, is in existence. The record is perfectly clear. When Gen. BATES, the military representative of the United States Government of August 20, 1899, with the Sultan and the several chiefs, that agreement was accepted and approved by the President, "subject to the action of Congress" with this express and distinct reservation:

"This agreement is not to be deemed in any way to authorize or give the consent of the United States to the retention of the Sulu archipelago, a thing which is made impossible by the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States."

Here Mr. BRYAN thought he saw an opportunity to propound a dilemma fatal to the Republican doctrine that the Constitution does not by its own force extend all its provisions to newly acquired territory. Either in hasty ignorance or with deliberate suppression of the main fact, he assumed that in admitting that the Thirteenth Amendment extends to the Sulu Islands President McKinley likewise admitted that the Constitutional provision respecting a uniform tariff extends to Porto Rico. Mr. BRYAN jumped at the chance, and indicted at Kalamaqua a letter to Mr. McKELJOHN in which he said:

"Since the President sent these instructions, the Republican party, with the approval of the Administration, has adopted the theory that the Constitution does not follow the flag, and therefore, the Thirteenth Amendment does not interfere with slavery in the Sulu archipelago."

The Porto Rican law asserts the doctrine that the people of Porto Rico are beyond the protection of the Constitution and can be governed by the arbitrary and unrestrained power of the President and Congress.

If the Constitution itself cannot reach the West Indies, how can the Thirteenth Amendment and its laws across the Pacific into Asia?

If Mr. BRYAN had taken the trouble to read the Thirteenth Amendment before talking and writing about it, he would not have uttered this question so triumphantly. He would have hesitated before assuming that because the Constitution makes it impossible for our Government to consent to the existence of slavery in the Sulu Islands, it makes it impossible to enact a special tariff for Porto Rico.

This is the text of the Thirteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution:

"Section 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

"Section 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

The clause which Mr. BRYAN has overlooked, or pretends to overlook, we have italicized. The notable thing about it is that it occurs nowhere else in the Constitution. It extends in advance and specifically the prohibition of slavery not only to the States of the Union and the organized Territories of the United States, but also to all places "subject to the jurisdiction" of the United States, meaning an unorganized territory which this Government may acquire, and for which it may become

responsible. It applies to just such unorganized territory as the Sulu Islands, under the sovereignty and jurisdiction of the United States. It was that Constitutional prohibition which President McKinley had in mind when he said that the consent of the United States to the existence of slavery in the Sulu archipelago was made impossible by the Thirteenth Amendment.

Now, what is the language of the Constitution respecting the uniformity of taxation? Mr. BRYAN would have people suppose that it reads:

"All duties, imports and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States and all places subject to their jurisdiction."

But that is not its language. The special mention of territory outside the "United States" but subject to their jurisdiction is not found here. It says only:

"All duties, imports and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

That is, throughout the States of the Union and organized Territories over which the Constitution has been extended or may hereafter be extended by act of Congress.

That is why the Thirteenth Amendment happens to find its way "across the Pacific into Asia," to use Mr. BRYAN's phrase, while other parts of the Constitution do not extend by their own force even so far as Porto Rico.

Mr. McKELJOHN has rendered good public service by drawing from Mr. BRYAN a letter which exhibits that candidate either as a gross ignoramus or as a shallow charlatan. Such is the dilemma thrust upon him.

"We Wish to Remain Free People."

The manner in which the local Anti-Imperialist League has prosecuted its pretended campaign against "militarism and monarchy," under the grotesque motto of "We Wish to Remain Free People," has been such as to make its inherent absurdity additionally ridiculous. The Anti-Imperialist League has introduced two notable features, one being the regular attendance of a barytone singer at its barytone meetings, and the other the reading of the Fifteenth Amendment respecting the abridgment of the right of the citizens of the United States to vote regardless of "race, color or previous condition of servitude."

The barytone sings "America" and the Fifteenth Amendment of the Constitution is read, and then anti-imperialist speakers are heard. The meetings which they address are not held in halls or ordinary saloons, but in beer shops or liquor parlors, and the frugal as well as prudent rule has been adopted of having the saloon proprietor or his barkeeper act as chairman, the attendance being chiefly supplied by the patrons of the place. Under such conditions and at very small expense meetings are held in various parts of the town, and they are most numerous in those districts in which available liquor saloons are most numerous.

The most conspicuous, consistent and energetic anti-imperialist in New York in the details of organization has been the Hon. TIMOTHY DRYDOLLAR SULLIVAN, who is now engrossed with his canvass for reelection as Senator for the Eleventh district.

Increasing Unity Against Bryanism.

In these last weeks of the canvass there appear increasingly from day to day the same signs of unity among the opponents of Bryanism which presaged his defeat four years ago.

The public announcements by prominent Democrats of New York and throughout the Eastern States of their determination to assist in the destruction of slavery and imperialism are multiplying steadily; but we find even more of them in newspapers of the West. Besides the Gold Democrats of 1896, very many Democrats and Republicans who supported BRYAN then are now crowding newspaper columns with frank declarations that they have been convinced by the prosperous conditions following his defeat that they acted unwisely and will support Mr. McKINLEY this election.

That Gold Democrats should continue thus their strenuous opposition to BRYAN is creditable to their general intelligence, to their common sense, but it also indicates particularly their sagacity as Democratic partisans. They know very well that if the Democratic party is ever again to become a tolerable home for them or for any political conservatism it must now be cleansed of Bryanism once for all. It must be warned, and with it all parties for all time to come, that no party whose engineers shall be used for an attack on the security of property and in an attempt to stir up class prejudice and animosity can escape the resentment of the American people, without regard to partisan divisions. No such issues are permissible in our politics; and consequently BRYAN's desperate policy in introducing them into this canvass arouses the whole patriotic and intelligent sentiment of the electorate to united resistance to the forbidden assault.

At such a time the same differences of political theory and opinion which in the past kept this country divided closely between two parties are set aside, for the immediate necessity is unity against political insanity. Issues have been introduced which sweep away lines and marks of separation that once were preserved by earnest partisanship—issues wholly outside of safe or tolerable politics. Touching them there is no difference between Democrat or Republican and party names lose their significance.

That is the explanation of this Democratic revolt against Bryanism in every State of the Union. In this whole canvass, for instance, there is no more earnest, more relentless campaign than that which is now conducted by the Honest Money Democratic League of Maryland. The Baltimore Sun, for one reason or another, is as inconspicuously as unconspicuously supporting BRYAN. Accordingly that League, including the best ability and intelligence of Baltimore, has gone to the expense of publishing regularly contrary and convincing facts and arguments in the advertising columns of that paper. These true and honest Democrats are working for no other political gain than the gain which would come to all Maryland and to every other State from the defeat of BRYAN and the election of Mr. McKINLEY. It is a noble effort made with conspicuous ability.

Throughout the Union this wise and patriotic activity on the part of intelligent Democrats is now proceeding, and in Indiana, notable always as a close State politically, they are especially earnest and powerful in it. Of the members of the two cabinets of Mr. CLEVELAND, twenty in all, only one, Mr. OLNEY, has ventured to come out openly for BRYAN. The most distinguished of them, Mr. CARLISLE, is at the head of the Lawyers' Sound Money League

of New York, in which are included the ablest and most prominent of the Democratic members of the New York bar. Mr. EDWARD M. SHEPARD is to preside at a Bryan demonstration when the silver candidate comes to New York, but he will be without countenance from the distinction of the legal profession.

In these closing days of the canvass the campaign of 1896 is repeated and in some respects more impressively. Republicans are stimulated to make themselves worthy of allies so noble. The only effectual way for all hands to prove their zeal is for every man of them to register and to vote.

The Selection of the Selectors.

The canvass of the ballots for admission to the Hall of Fame is disclosing some extraordinary things.

What, for example, is to be thought of the literary discrimination of a President of one of the foremost universities in the land who withheld his vote from NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE while giving it to NOAH WEBSTER, the Dictionary maker?

It is true that Mr. ex-President of the United States took the same hebdomadous view of the comparative merits of HAWTHORNE and NOAH WEBSTER. It is probable that the Hon. GROVER CLEVELAND feels a deeper sense of personal obligation to the lexicographer than to the man of imagination. But that circumstance does not render less astonishing the vote of President ARTHUR T. HADLEY of Yale.

Still more surprising is the fact that among the chosen arbiters of Fame there should have been two jurists, Chief Justice BLOOMFIELD of South Dakota and Chief Justice NICHOLS of Louisiana, who refused as a matter of principle to vote for HAWTHORNE, EMERSON, IRVING, LONGFELLOW or any other author, apparently on the theory that no d-d literary fellow is entitled to grateful or reverential remembrance.

Interest in the completion of the list by the judges is temporarily obscured by wonder as to the method pursued in selecting the judges themselves.

Not one of the calamity predictions made by BRYAN four years ago has been fulfilled. Register and vote against his realization in the four years to come, by voting against him.

The high traditions of the Wisconsin School of Female Poles, an institution somewhat in abeyance for a dozen years past, seem likely to be revived in the person of Miss Augustus. This young woman contributes to the Evening Wisconsin a poem entitled "The Man Without the Hoe," her intention being, we suppose, to show what genius can do in the way of broderie upon a threadbare theme. Her treatment of the subject is certainly original. She does not say "the man who takes his hoe, when first the sun with rose-tinted points the East." She sweeps rather for the man described in the following stanza:

"The man who chooses as his mate for life
Whom his blood and bones most passionately stir,
Which being said, and her beauty fixed,
He expelled all colored members were subsequently repeated, and colored members have occupied seats in nearly every Georgia Legislature since. Two counties are now represented by negroes who were chosen to the Legislature at the general State election held on the 1st inst.

It is an interesting fact that among the negro members expelled from the Legislature in 1895 was Henry M. Turner of Bibb County. He is now Bishop Turner of the African Church and an ardent supporter of Mr. Bryan because, as the Bishop alleges, President McKinley has favored the negro.

THE ENLIGHTENED SENTIMENT OF GEORGIA.

A Striking Letter from Ex-Governor Bullock of That State.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN:—Sir: The communication of Col. Alexander R. Lawton of Savannah, with your editorial comment thereon, has attracted wide attention and republication in the press of our State.

For Col. Lawton I have great esteem, both on account of his own high character and marked ability and because of my regard for his distinguished father, now dead, who was my intimate superior officer in the Confederate service. No patriot citizen or braver soldier than Gen. A. R. Lawton ever lived.

Col. Lawton gives five consecutive reasons why he and other patriotic Georgians will vote for the reelection of President McKinley. In his sixth he says: "We are hopeful that Mr. McKinley has been a better citizen and will treat our Southern people fairly and bravely, and carefully refrain from humiliating them."

The text of Col. Lawton's communication makes it plain that in his opinion the President's appointment of colored men to Federal positions in Georgia constitutes the "former error" and that a repetition of such appointments will "humiliate" us. Now, I am prepared to maintain that in the President's appointments for Georgia he has treated our people "fairly and bravely."

In a political sense all American citizens resident in Georgia are "our people" and of the right of Georgia to control appointments would render the President's action manifestly unfair and narrow.

It is within my personal knowledge that the desire, as to home affairs, nearest the President's heart is the unification of the people in the sections that were at war with each other. It is his aim to give to the whole people, men generally have given the highest evidence of this desire on his part. Consider Lee and Wheeler and other Confederate leaders now holding his commission. Remember the hosts of our Southern sons, Col. Lawton among them, received into the armies of the United States. All the ablest and bravest men of Georgia were appointed by the President on the recommendation of our Congressmen, all of whom are Democrats. How could a Republican be more liberal than President McKinley?

The member for Georgia of the National Republican Committee selected in 1896 was Judge J. L. G. of Augusta. He is a worthy, educated colored man, raised in that city, and a lawyer by profession. He is respected by the members of the bar and by his fellow-citizens. No word has ever been said against his character or ability. He was recommended by his party organization for Postmaster at Augusta in August, 1896, and he has since performed the duties of that office; but, owing to the protests made by some of the people of that city on the color line, the President appointed Lyons to the higher office of Register of the Treasury at Washington. The President refused to do so because of his color, and the excellent which his appointment at Augusta might have engendered. Did this action of the President "humiliate our Southern people?"

The right of a colored man to hold office in Georgia is not a new question with us. The Legislature of 1868, during Mr. Administration, by the solid vote of the reactionists, the Democrats, elected by a few Republicans, who sought to popularize their party and themselves by yielding to the color prejudice, decided that a negro had no right to hold office in Georgia and expelled a few colored members, save one who had more than three-quarters white blood. He was expelled because he had been a slave. Colored members were subsequently repeated, and colored members have occupied seats in nearly every Georgia Legislature since. Two counties are now represented by negroes who were chosen to the Legislature at the general State election held on the 1st inst.

It is an interesting fact that among the negro members expelled from the Legislature in 1868 was Henry M. Turner of Bibb County. He is now Bishop Turner of the African Church and an ardent supporter of Mr. Bryan because, as the Bishop alleges, President McKinley has favored the negro.

The appointments which Col. Lawton condemns as "color prejudice" are Savannah and Columbus. Col. Lawton is a worthy, educated colored man, raised in that city, and a lawyer by profession. He is respected by the members of the bar and by his fellow-citizens. No word has ever been said against his character or ability. He was recommended by his party organization for Postmaster at Augusta in August, 1896, and he has since performed the duties of that office; but, owing to the protests made by some of the people of that city on the color line, the President appointed Lyons to the higher office of Register of the Treasury at Washington. The President refused to do so because of his color, and the excellent which his appointment at Augusta might have engendered. Did this action of the President "humiliate our Southern people?"

The right of a colored man to hold office in Georgia is not a new question with us. The Legislature of 1868, during Mr. Administration, by the solid vote of the reactionists, the Democrats, elected by a few Republicans, who sought to popularize their party and themselves by yielding to the color prejudice, decided that a negro had no right to hold office in Georgia and expelled a few colored members, save one who had more than three-quarters white blood. He was expelled because he had been a slave. Colored members were subsequently repeated, and colored members have occupied seats in nearly every Georgia Legislature since. Two counties are now represented by negroes who were chosen to the Legislature at the general State election held on the 1st inst.

It is an interesting fact that among the negro members expelled from the Legislature in 1868 was Henry M. Turner of Bibb County. He is now Bishop Turner of the African Church and an ardent supporter of Mr. Bryan because, as the Bishop alleges, President McKinley has favored the negro.

The appointments which Col. Lawton condemns as "color prejudice" are Savannah and Columbus. Col. Lawton is a worthy, educated colored man, raised in that city, and a lawyer by profession. He is respected by the members of the bar and by his fellow-citizens. No word has ever been said against his character or ability. He was recommended by his party organization for Postmaster at Augusta in August, 1896, and he has since performed the duties of that office; but, owing to the protests made by some of the people of that city on the color line, the President appointed Lyons to the higher office of Register of the Treasury at Washington. The President refused to do so because of his color, and the excellent which his appointment at Augusta might have engendered. Did this action of the President "humiliate our Southern people?"

The right of a colored man to hold office in Georgia is not a new question with us. The Legislature of 1868, during Mr. Administration, by the solid vote of the reactionists, the Democrats, elected by a few Republicans, who sought to popularize their party and themselves by yielding to the color prejudice, decided that a negro had no right to hold office in Georgia and expelled a few colored members, save one who had more than three-quarters white blood. He was expelled because he had been a slave. Colored members were subsequently repeated, and colored members have occupied seats in nearly every Georgia Legislature since. Two counties are now represented by negroes who were chosen to the Legislature at the general State election held on the 1st inst.

It is an interesting fact that among the negro members expelled from the Legislature in 1868 was Henry M. Turner of Bibb County. He is now Bishop Turner of the African Church and an ardent supporter of Mr. Bryan because, as the Bishop alleges, President McKinley has favored the negro.

The appointments which Col. Lawton condemns as "color prejudice" are Savannah and Columbus. Col. Lawton is a worthy, educated colored man, raised in that city, and a lawyer by profession. He is respected by the members of the bar and by his fellow-citizens. No word has ever been said against his character or ability. He was recommended by his party organization for Postmaster at Augusta in August, 1896, and he has since performed the duties of that office; but, owing to the protests made by some of the people of that city on the color line, the President appointed Lyons to the higher office of Register of the Treasury at Washington. The President refused to do so because of his color, and the excellent which his appointment at Augusta might have engendered. Did this action of the President "humiliate our Southern people?"

The right of a colored man to hold office in Georgia is not a new question with us. The Legislature of 1868, during Mr. Administration, by the solid vote of the reactionists, the Democrats, elected by a few Republicans, who sought to popularize their party and themselves by yielding to the color prejudice, decided that a negro had no right to hold office in Georgia and expelled a few colored members, save one who had more than three-quarters white blood. He was expelled because he had been a slave. Colored members were subsequently repeated, and colored members have occupied seats in nearly every Georgia Legislature since. Two counties are now represented by negroes who were chosen to the Legislature at the general State election held on the 1st inst.

It is an interesting fact that among the negro members expelled from the Legislature in 1868 was Henry M. Turner of Bibb County. He is now Bishop Turner of the African Church and an ardent supporter of Mr. Bryan because, as the Bishop alleges, President McKinley has favored the negro.

The appointments which Col. Lawton condemns as "color prejudice" are Savannah and Columbus. Col. Lawton is a worthy, educated colored man, raised in that city, and a lawyer by profession. He is respected by the members of the bar and by his fellow-citizens. No word has ever been said against his character or ability. He was recommended by his party organization for Postmaster at Augusta in August, 1896, and he has since performed the duties of that office; but, owing to the protests made by some of the people of that city on the color line, the President appointed Lyons to the higher office of Register of the Treasury at Washington. The President refused to do so because of his color, and the excellent which his appointment at Augusta might have engendered. Did this action of the President "humiliate our Southern people?"

The right of a colored man to hold office in Georgia is not a new question with us. The Legislature of 1868, during Mr. Administration, by the solid vote of the reactionists, the Democrats, elected by a few Republicans, who sought to popularize their party and themselves by yielding to the color prejudice, decided that a negro had no right to hold office in Georgia and expelled a few colored members, save one who had more than three-quarters white blood. He was expelled because he had been a slave. Colored members were subsequently repeated, and colored members have occupied seats in nearly every Georgia Legislature since. Two counties are now represented by negroes who were chosen to the Legislature at the general State election held on the 1st inst.

It is an interesting fact that among the negro members expelled from the Legislature in 1868 was Henry M. Turner of Bibb County. He is now Bishop Turner of the African Church and an ardent supporter of Mr. Bryan because, as the Bishop alleges, President McKinley has favored the negro.

The appointments which Col. Lawton condemns as "color prejudice" are Savannah and Columbus. Col. Lawton is a worthy, educated colored man, raised in that city, and a lawyer by profession. He is respected by the members of the bar and by his fellow-citizens. No word has ever been said against his character or ability. He was recommended by his party organization for Postmaster at Augusta in August, 1896, and he has since performed the duties of that office; but, owing to the protests made by some of the people of that city on the color line, the President appointed Lyons to the higher office of Register of the Treasury at Washington. The President refused to do so because of his color, and the excellent which his appointment at Augusta might have engendered. Did this action of the President "humiliate our Southern people?"

The right of a colored man to hold office in Georgia is not a new question with us. The Legislature of 1868, during Mr. Administration, by the solid vote of the reactionists, the Democrats, elected by a few Republicans, who sought to popularize their party and themselves by yielding to the color prejudice, decided that a negro had no right to hold office in Georgia and expelled a few colored members, save one who had more than three-quarters white blood. He was expelled because he had been a slave. Colored members were subsequently repeated, and colored members have occupied seats in nearly every Georgia Legislature since. Two counties are now represented by negroes who were chosen to the Legislature at the general State election held on the 1st inst.

It is an interesting fact that among the negro members expelled from the Legislature in 1868 was Henry M. Turner of Bibb County. He is now Bishop Turner of the African Church and an ardent supporter of Mr. Bryan because, as the Bishop alleges, President McKinley has favored the negro.

The appointments which Col. Lawton condemns as "color prejudice" are Savannah and Columbus. Col. Lawton is a worthy, educated colored man, raised in that city, and a lawyer by profession. He is respected by the members of the bar and by his fellow-citizens. No word has ever been said against his character or ability. He was recommended by his party organization for Postmaster at Augusta in August, 1896, and he has since performed the duties of that office; but, owing to the protests made by some of the people of that city on the color line, the President appointed Lyons to the higher office of Register of the Treasury at Washington. The President refused to do so because of his color, and the excellent which his appointment at Augusta might have engendered. Did this action of the President "humiliate our Southern people?"

The right of a colored man to hold office in Georgia is not a new question with us. The Legislature of 1868, during Mr. Administration, by the solid vote of the reactionists, the Democrats, elected by a few Republicans, who sought to popularize their party and themselves by yielding to the color prejudice, decided that a negro had no right to hold office in Georgia and expelled a few colored members, save one who had more than three-quarters white blood. He was expelled because he had been a slave. Colored members were subsequently repeated, and colored members have occupied seats in nearly every Georgia Legislature since. Two counties are now represented by negroes who were chosen to the Legislature at the general State election held on the 1st inst.

It is an interesting fact that among the negro members expelled from the Legislature in 1868 was Henry M. Turner of Bibb County. He is now Bishop Turner of the African Church and an ardent supporter of Mr. Bryan because, as the Bishop alleges, President McKinley has favored the negro.

The appointments which Col. Lawton condemns as "color prejudice" are Savannah and Columbus. Col. Lawton is a worthy, educated colored man, raised in that city, and a lawyer by profession. He is respected by the members of the bar and by his fellow-citizens. No word has ever been said against his character or ability. He was recommended by his party organization for Postmaster at Augusta in August, 1896, and he has since performed the duties of that office; but, owing to the protests made by some of the people of that city on the color line, the President appointed Lyons to the higher office of Register of the Treasury at Washington. The President refused to do so because of his color, and the excellent which his appointment at Augusta might have engendered. Did this action of the President "humiliate our Southern people?"

The right of a colored man to hold office in Georgia is not a new question with us. The Legislature of 1868, during Mr. Administration, by the solid vote of the reactionists, the Democrats, elected by a few Republicans, who sought to popularize their party and themselves by yielding to the color prejudice, decided that a negro had no right to hold office in Georgia and expelled a few colored members, save one who had more than three-quarters white blood. He was expelled because he had been a slave. Colored members were subsequently repeated, and colored members have occupied seats in nearly every Georgia Legislature since. Two counties are now represented by negroes who were chosen to the Legislature at the general State election held on the 1st inst.

It is an interesting fact that among the negro members expelled from the Legislature in 1868 was Henry M. Turner of Bibb County. He is now Bishop Turner of the African Church and an ardent supporter of Mr. Bryan because, as the Bishop alleges, President McKinley has favored the negro.

The appointments which Col. Lawton condemns as "color prejudice" are Savannah and Columbus. Col. Lawton is a worthy, educated colored man, raised in that city, and a lawyer by profession. He is respected by the members of the bar and by his fellow-citizens. No word has ever been said against his character or ability. He was recommended by his party organization for Postmaster at Augusta in August, 1896, and he has since performed the duties of that office; but, owing to the protests made by some of the people of that city on the color line, the President appointed Lyons to the higher office of Register of the Treasury at Washington. The President refused to do so because of his color, and the excellent which his appointment at Augusta might have engendered. Did this action of the President "humiliate our Southern people?"

The right of a colored man to hold office in Georgia is not a new question with us. The Legislature of 1868, during Mr. Administration, by the solid vote of the reactionists, the Democrats, elected by a few Republicans, who sought to popularize their party and themselves by yielding to the color prejudice, decided that a negro had no right to hold office in Georgia and expelled a few colored members, save one who had more than three-quarters white blood. He was expelled because he had been a slave. Colored members were subsequently repeated, and colored members have occupied seats in nearly every Georgia Legislature since. Two counties are now represented by negroes who were chosen to the Legislature at the general State election held on the 1st inst.

It is an interesting fact that among the negro members expelled from the Legislature in 1868 was Henry M. Turner of Bibb County. He is now Bishop Turner of the African Church and an ardent supporter of Mr. Bryan because, as the Bishop alleges, President McKinley has favored the negro.

The appointments which Col. Lawton condemns as "color prejudice" are Savannah and Columbus. Col. Lawton is a worthy, educated colored man, raised in that city, and a lawyer by profession. He is respected by the members of the bar and by his fellow-citizens. No word has ever been said against his character or ability. He was recommended by his party organization for Postmaster at Augusta in August, 1896, and he has since performed the duties of that office; but, owing to the protests made by some of the people of that city on the color line, the President appointed Lyons to the higher office of Register of the Treasury at Washington. The President refused to do so because of his color, and the excellent which his appointment at Augusta might have engendered. Did this action of the President "humiliate our Southern people?"

THE ENLIGHTENED SENTIMENT OF GEORGIA.

A Striking Letter from Ex-Governor Bullock of That State.

TO